



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IV.—THE WENZELBIBEL, COD. PAL. VINDOB. 2759-2764.

This, the most famous MS of the group called by Walther¹ "2. Zweig," comprises only the Old Testament, and that not quite complete. The MS is of parchment, and consists at present of six large folio volumes. A somewhat reduced facsimile of a page of the first volume is given by Walther opposite col. 296. The first volume contains the five books of Moses, and Joshua; the second, Judges, Ruth, and the four books of Kings; the third, Chronicles, Manasseh's Prayer, first to third Ezra, Tobias, and the first seven verses of Judith; the fourth, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Judith, Esther, Job, and the Latin introduction to the Psalms; the fifth, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Solomon's Song, Wisdom of S., Ecclesiasticus and Prayer of S.; the sixth, Isaiah, Jeremiah (without Lamentations), Baruch, Ezekiel. The MS is written in large Gothic letters. The literature is given by Walther, col. 291.

The material for the present paper was obtained in Vienna in the summer of 1898. Having occasion to examine the MS for the purposes of another investigation, I noticed that the MS had not as yet been accurately described as regards scribes and dialects, and therefore made notes and extracts which form the basis of this article. Recently, a book by F. Jelinek² has appeared, in which a considerable portion of my work has been anticipated. Jelinek first describes the MS and the scribes, points out certain errors of translation, and prints the prologue. He then discusses in order the various vowels and consonants, declension, conjugation, and certain syntactical phenomena. At

¹ Die deutsche Bibelübersetzung des Mittelalters, dargestellt von Wilh. Walther. Braunschweig, 1889-92.

² Die Sprache der Wenzelsbibel in ihrem Verhältnis zu der Sprache der wichtigsten deutschen Literatur- und Rechtsdenkmäler aus Böhmen und Mähren im XIV. Jahrhundert und der kaiserlichen Kanzlei der Luxemburger. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache von Dr. Franz Jelinek. Görz, 1899. Selbstverlag des Verfassers. Pp. 110. Dr. Göldlin von Tiefenau, Kustos of the Imperial library, who has most kindly given me additional information on doubtful points, also first informed me of the appearance of the above article.

the same time comparisons are made with various Bohemian texts of the fourteenth century. Finally, the various dialectic phenomena are summed up, and the author concludes that the translation originated at the end of the fourteenth century, in the region to the north or northwest of Prague.

In so far as the above paper has anticipated the present one, the treatment will be very brief; other questions will be treated more in detail.

Four scribes contributed to the work, who change about fifteen times. The first scribe wrote the first two volumes, and 6 ff. of the third (Gen. to Paral. 4. 38). The text is decidedly Middle German, though the long vowels are generally diphthongized. The pronoun *er* often appears as *her*, the earliest place noted being Gen. 18. 19, in the first volume. This writing becomes more and more frequent in the course of the first and second vols., extending into the third. Jelinek, p. 72, cites instances only from the third volume. M.H.G. *û* generally appears as *ou*, most frequently in the words *ous*, *ouf*. This scribe never writes *aus*, *auf*, in this early portion at least. Sometimes even the undiphthongized vowel appears, as in *cziten*, *fruntschaft*, and still oftener in *us*, *uf*, though in the beginning this is rare. The old diphthong *ou* generally appears as *ou*, though later *au* appears. Flexional *i* is frequent; *ver-* uniformly appears as *vor-*; "rückumlaut" preterites are very frequent; *ie* often appears as *i*; the suffix *-lich* appears as such; the diphthong of *i*, as also the old diphthong *ei*, are written *ei*.

This scribe continues to vol. 3, f. 6^{verso}. Fol. 7^{recto} begins (I Paral. 4. 38): | -ret grossleich uñ sie ingiengen in gadar uncz zu dem aufgangk des tals.¹ This is by a Bavarian scribe (2), forms such as *tail*, *waid*, *aus*, *hawser*, *tragund*, *pergk*, *schoffen* (*ovibus*) *gewant* (= *o*), occurring on this page. The writing is larger, the ink blacker, illustrations and superscriptions are lacking, while they do occur on the pages immediately preceding and following. Fol. 7^{verso} is blank, with the exception of one line. F. 7^{recto} ends (I Paral. 5. 18): pogen zu dem streitt | and the verso contains: | vier und vierczigk tausendt. On f. 8^{recto} the first scribe sets in again, the line on f. 7^v being repeated thus: vier und vierczik tausentt und siben hundert und vierczik czihende

¹ I quote the text and places according to the Vulgate, where the various changes occur, as these are not given by Jelinek. Indeed the whole matter of the scribes is disposed of by him in less than a page.

zu streite. This repetition, which occurs at almost every change of scribes, generally gives an indication of the change of dialect, cf. *tausendt* : *tousentt*. Sometimes only one word is repeated; at others, nearly a whole sentence. The reason for this varying repetition is not yet entirely clear to me: Jelinek does not note these repetitions at all.

It is evident that fol. 7 was inserted later by the Bavarian scribe (2), who supplied a gap left by scribe 1. The omission by scribe 1 probably came about as follows:—Up to 4. 38, where the break occurs, the text consists entirely of an enumeration of the various families. With the next verse the narrative sets in, continuing to the end of the chapter. In the following chapter the enumeration of the families begins again, and continues to verse 18, where the narrative begins again. The scribe probably made a pause, and on commencing again found the place where the enumeration of the families ends, but in the fifth chapter, instead of the fourth. Jelinek assumes, p. 4, bot., that, along with others, this leaf had been lost and then replaced by the Bavarian scribe. If this were the case, we should expect both sides of the new leaf to be filled, and more than filled, for the writing on the new leaf is larger than that of scribe 1.

The first scribe, who sets in again f. 8^r, continues to the end of f. 128^v: Und hast uns gegeben ein solich wurtzen || (III Esdras 8. 88). On f. 129^r the Bavarian scribe (2) sets in again: | sölēiche wurcñn und haben wider umbgekert . . . Characteristic forms such as *vermischt*, *unraynigkait*, *aus*, *auf*, *junkchfrawn*, *waynund*, *weliben* (= *b*) (col. 1, l. 14), *nymbar* (= *w*) (l. 16), occur on this page; on f. 130: *pischolf*, *puech*, *grosleich*. (For *pischolf* cf. Weinhold, Bair. Gram., §159.) This Bavarian scribe (2) continues to the end of f. 136^v: chert auch gesunnter herwider zw uns und deine augenn | (= Tobias 5. 26). On f. 137^r the Middle German scribe (1) sets in again: | ougen werden yn sehen wene ich geloube . . .

This change of scribes helps to solve a question concerning the translation itself. Jelinek, it may be noted, does not mention the existence of any related MSS, whereas at least eleven exist; cf. Walther, col. 291. One of these, cgm. 341, may possibly be older than the Wenzelbibel. At all events, the other MSS do not descend from the Wb., but from some other MS now lost. This will be shown conclusively later on. In spite of these MSS Jelinek treats the Wb. as if it were a unique, original translation,

and merely refers to a "Concept," which in all the wanderings and vicissitudes of the MS remained with it, so that later, lost portions could be replaced by the Bavarian scribes! On p. 12 he asserts rather naïvely that a comparison with the second pre-Lutheran printed Bible proves this to be a different translation. It is thus evident that he is entirely ignorant of the work of Walther, who proved this fact nearly ten years ago.

In the matter of the text and scribes of the Wb., Walther, to be sure, is not very successful. In the first place, he fails to note the presence of the third book of Esdras, which in the MS continues the second book (Nehemiah) without a break or change in the superscriptions; at the end, f. 131^v, the scribe wrote: "alhie endt sich das ander puech Esdras," which, no doubt, also misled Walther. This confusion probably existed very early in the translation, and was not brought about by the scribe of the Wb., for the Maihingen MS to be quoted later also shares this confusion. Walther therefore states, col. 306: "Wunderbarer-weise bietet die Wenzelbibel im Buche Tobias eine durchaus andere Uebersetzung als die übrigen Handschriften. Wir haben diese Partie von dem 2. Uebersetzungskreise auszuschliessen, und werden sie später als den fünften Zweig behandeln." Later, cols. 348-350, he treats the book of Tobias under the heading "5. Zweig."

Walther is unable to determine where this new translation has its beginning and end. During my stay in Vienna I was also unable to determine this, not being able to compare with the texts of the other MSS. Later, on comparing extracts from the Maihingen MS, from Tobias 8. 3-10, and 11. 3, which I had made for other purposes, I found that in these passages the Wb. agreed with the text of Maihingen and the rest, so that the return to the old translation in the Wb. must have taken place before this. The Bavarian scribe, as before noted, had stopped at f. 136^v = Tobias 5. 26, and I therefore suspected that the "5. Zweig" of Walther ended with this scribe, and probably also began with the same, III Esdras 8. 88. Dr. Göldlin v. Tiefenau kindly sent me a copy of the last lines of f. 128^v, and Dr. G. Grupp at Maihingen copied the corresponding portions of the Maihingen MS III D. 1, fol. 1, which belongs to the same group, but contains the uniform translation of Walther's "2. Zweig." A comparison of the two texts proved my conjecture to be correct. To the bottom of f. 128^v of the Wb. the two MSS agree almost letter for letter,

whereas from f. 129^r they are entirely different, as a glance at the annexed texts will show. This difference continues to f. 136^v incl. of the Wb., = Tobias 5. 26, and on the following page they again agree exactly. The new translation was therefore inserted by the Bavarian scribe (2), and extends from III Esdras 8. 88 to Tobias 5. 26, exactly 8 pp., a signature.

Cod. Pal. Vind. 2761, f^o 128^v,
col. 2, ll. 23-36.

(III Esdras 8. 85 seqq.)

. Und nu ewer töch-
ter nicht fuget zū iren Sunē
Und ire tochter nemet nicht
ewern sunen. Und süchet
nicht vride zu haben mit
yn alle czeit. so das oberwī-
dende esset die guten der
erden. Und teilet das erbe
ewern sunen untz bis ewi-
clich. Und was euch wider
vert | das geschicht alles
durch ewer posen werk un
durch ewer grosen unde.
Und hast uns gegeben ein
apponatur: solich wurtzen
(End of f^o 128^v.)

f^o 129^{recto}, col. 1, l. 1.

soleiche wurczn̄ und ha-
ben wider umbgekeret ze
übertreten dein saczung
das wir uns vermüschet
würden der unrāynnig-
kait des ausserlendischen
volchs des daygen lan-
dts wirst du dann herr ich-
czürnen uns. und uns ze-
uerderben. Als langk daz
nicht beleib unser wurczn̄
und nam. Herr got israhel'
der du warhaftig pist. weñ
weliben ist dy warhaft
wurczn̄ ünczt auf den heu-
ttigen tag. Nymbar yeczūt
sey wir in unsern poszhait
ten vor deinem angesicht.
etc.

Maihingen MS III D. 1, fol. 1.

Und nu ewer tocht-
ter nit fuget zu iren sunen
und ir tochter nemet nicht
ewern sunen und suchet
nit fryde zu haben mit
yn alezit so das uberwin-
dende esset dy guten der
erden und teylet das erbe
ewern sunen unc̄z bis ewi-
glichen und was euch wider-
veret das geschicht alles
durch ewer pose werck und
dorch ewer gross unde
und hast uns geben ein
semlich wurtzeln

und aber
wider sein wir wider gekart zu
ubertreten dein elichen werk
so das wir uns vormischten
der unreynigkeit fremder
heyden diser
erden.

nicht zurne uns
vorliesend uns unc̄z bis
nicht gelassen werd
unser czweigk und
unser nam. Herre got
warhaft bistu: wen
verlassen ist der
czweig bis in desen
heutigen tagk. Sich nu
sey wir in unsern sünden
in diner angesicht.
etc.

Cod. Pal. Vind. 2761, fo. 136^{verso},
col. 2, l. 3 to end of page.
(Tobias 5. 23 seqq.)

.. Und do sy nw fertig warn
do hueb an sein muter ze way
nen und sprechen zum vater
Nw hast du genomen dein
aufhaltung den stab unsers
alters und hast yn gesant
von uns. Nymmer mer solt
sein das selbig gelt. Darumb
du yn gesant hast. Genuegt
hyet vns vnser armut das wirs
geschäczet hietē fur reichumb
So wir angesehē hietē unsern
sun. Do sprach zu yr Thobias
Du scholt nicht waynenn
unser Sun chumbt gesunt
ter do hynn Und chert au
ch' gesunntter herwider zw
uns und deine augenn
(End of fo. 136^{verso}.)

fo. 137^{recto}, col. 1, l. 1, etc.

ougen werden yn sehen. wē
ne ich geloube das der gute
engel gotes wander mit im
und schicke wol alle dink di
pei im werden gehandelt al
so das . . . etc.

Maihingen MS III D. 1, fol. 1.

.. und do sy hin geczogen waren
do begonde sein muter weynen
und sprechen den stap unsers
alters hastu
genūmen
und hast yn gesant
von uns das nicht were
das gelt nach dem
du yn gesant hast wen genuget
hett uns unser armūt und
als den reichūme hetten wir ge-
achtet das das wir hetten gesehen un-
sūne Und thobias sprach zu ir [sern
nicht wein
gesund kumpt unss sune
herwider
zu uns
und deyn augen

werden in sehen und
ich glaub das der gut
engel gotes mit ym wander
und schicke wol alle dingk dy
by ym werden gehandelt al-
so das . . . etc.

Of this new translation III Esdras 8. 88–Tobias 5. 26 there are no further traces. To assume with Jelinek, pp. 4, 5, that this portion had been lost from the MS and replaced by the Bavarian scribe (2) is not possible, for the new scribe would not at all have been able in that case to gauge his work so as to fill exactly eight pages. We must assume that this portion was written before that which follows.

The Middle German scribe (1), who sets in again here, on f. 137^r, continues to the end of vol. 3, f. 144. This is another signature of 8 pp., and contains the rest of Tobias and seven verses of Judith. Thus far the order of the books has been that of the Vulgate; but the fourth volume, instead of continuing Judith, begins with Isaiah. This is the work of the Bavarian

scribe again, who continues to f. 10^v, only one-fourth of the verso being filled. In this section there are no illustrations. The first col. of f. 10^v ends, about half-way down the page: *wirt sy fressen und enczunt wirt in der dikche des waldes* (Isaiah 9. 18). The italicized words are by a later hand. The second column is blank, with the exception of the line at the bottom: *wirt id' dikche*. These are the work of the Bavarian scribe (2), and continue the sentence from *enczunt*. A later reviser inserted the same words above, immediately after *enczunt*. This later reviser was also a Bavarian, to judge from the form *dikche*.

On f. 11^r another scribe commences: *wirt si in der dicke des waldes und vorwandelt wirt si mit einander*. This scribe (3) is also Middle German, but different from (1), who consistently wrote *ous*, *ouf*, and sometimes *us*, *uf*, but never *au*, *aw*; this scribe (3) generally writes *us*, *uf*, sometimes *au*, but never *ou*, the most common form of (1). Other differences between these two scribes will be noted later. Scribe 3 has a strong admixture of Bavarian forms, such as *guldeiner*, *bawern*, *schawen*, *haus*, *mawer*; old *û* generally appears as *au*, *aw*, except in the words *us*, *uf*. This scribe continues through the "*gepete ieremie*," to f. 146^r, of which only one-third of a column is filled. The verso is blank. F. 147^r is also blank. With f. 147^v, at the top, another scribe (4), Bavarian, commences: *Hie hebt sich an das buch das do heisset Judith mit semelichen worten*. The page ends, Judith 1. 7: *und sein hercze wart*. | This scribe has *ai*, *ue*, *au*, even in *aus*, *auf*, which latter writing distinguishes him from both the Middle German scribes, while the absence of further Bavarian characteristics distinguishes him from the Bavarian scribe 2.

On f. 148^r the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again, Judith 1. 7: *wart erhaben*. Here we have as a rule *ous*, *tousent*, but also *aus*, *tausent*. It is the same scribe 1, but the instances of *au* are more frequent.

The mixed state of affairs in the first part of vol. 4 is to be explained as follows: Vol. 3, it will be remembered, ended with Judith 1. 7, scribe 1, and f. 148 of vol. 4 forms the proper continuation of this, by the same scribe. By mistake the portion written by scribe 3, vol. 4, ff. 11-146, was inserted. Then the Bavarian scribe 2 added ff. 1-10 of vol. 4, in order to have Isaiah complete. Later, the Bavarian scribe 4 inserted f. 147, in order to have Judith complete. He copied this from vol. 3, f. 144, which had been written by the Middle German scribe 1, and this

probably accounts for the absence of further Bavarian characteristics, as the passage was not extended enough to enable him to get into the swing of his own dialect. That f. 147, and also ff. 1-10, of vol. 4 were inserted later, is shown by the fact that three-fourths of f. 10^v, as well as the whole of 147^r, are blank.

The Middle German scribe 1 continues from f. 148 to the end of vol. 4, f. 211. Volume 5, beginning with the Psalter, to f. 186 incl. is also the work of this scribe, though his language contains more Bavarian elements. At the beginning of vol. 5, before the Psalter, is a table of contents, beginning: "In dem gegenburtigen puech sind vermerkt die hernachgeben puecher . . ."; and the date, 1447. Dr. Göddlin von Tiefenau considers it possible that the scribe of this table of contents is the same as the one on f. 147, vol. 4, while Jelinek considers it almost certain that they are identical.

The Middle German scribe 1 continues to Ecclesiasticus 34. 24: angesichte des vaters. | On f. 187^r, vol. 5, the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in: | das prat der durstigen ist ein leben des armen . . . In this portion characteristic Bavarian forms occur, such as *dew* (= *die*), *gesuechet*, *chain*, *gedenkch*, *andrew*, *erwekch*, *schikch*, *gefolkleich*, *froleich*, *gebund*, *werich*, *verpirig*, *widerbertig* (= *w*), *weyroch*.

This scribe continues to the bottom of f. 192^v: si werdent wirt-schefften in seine gepoten und | On f. 193^r the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again, Ecclesiasticus 39. 37: | werden sie wirt-schefften und ouf der erden in der notdurft werden sie bereitet . . . This scribe continues through vol. 5, into vol. 6. Through some mistake the rubric at the end of Ecclesiasticus reads *genant ist sprichwörter*. Vol. 6 begins with Isaiah, this time in the correct order of the Vulgate. Here the diphthong of *û* is generally written *au*, except in the words *ous*, *ouf*. Scribe 1 continues to the end of f. 123^v: von den steten iuda | (= Jerem. 34. 7). On the next leaf the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in again: | juda gemawrte stete das wort das do wart . . . This scribe continues to the bottom of f. 130^v, = Jerem. 40. 1: gefuert wurde gegen Babilon und das |. On the next leaf the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again: | babilon und das haus . . . He continues to the bottom of 138^v, = Jerem. 46. 2: den do |. On the next leaf the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in: | den do slueg nabuchodonasor kunig von babilō in dem virden iare . . . In this section are a number of instances of *vorlesen*, and other words with *vor-*, whereas in

other places this scribe generally uses the form *ver-*. The *vor-* must be from the Middle German original. The scribe continues to f. 152^v, = Jerem. 52. 34: *uncz bis an dē tage seines todes alle die tage seines lebens*. This is the end of the prophecy of Jeremiah, but the Lamentations are omitted. On the next page the Middle German scribe 1 sets in again, with the book of Baruch: *hie hebet sich an di vorrede in das buch baruch*. The following forms occur: f. 153^r, *pristern, ous*; f. 153^v, *aus* (2), *tak*; f. 154^r, *gotis, wek, aus, iczleicher*; f. 161^v, *auf, gotis, dorin, vor-, wek*; f. 206^v, *aus*; f. 220^v, *ouf*, but *auf* more frequent. In this portion *au* is much more frequent than in the other sections assigned to this scribe, but it is reasonably certain that we have to do with the same scribe. This scribe continues to the end of f. 224, = Ezek. 45. 9: *gerichte gar un̄ |*. On f. 225^r the Bavarian scribe 2 sets in again: *| und tut gerechtikait*. The writing is quite different from the preceding. Characteristic forms occur, such as (f. 225^r) *gerechtikait, abschaidt, trukchener, subenten* (3), *moneids, gays-pokch*; f. 227^r, *dresigk, gankch*. This scribe continues to the end of the work, f. 231^r, middle of col. 1, the end of the book of Ezekiel.

Jelinek, p. 4, does not notice this last change of scribes, f. 224–225, and in fact assigns this whole section, ff. 153–231, to the Middle German scribe 3, whereas it is very clear that this scribe had nothing to do with either of these sections. In the first place, the writing on f. 225 shows that a change of scribes occurred there, which Jelinek overlooked. In the next place, the section 153–224 shows *ous, aus* exclusively, whereas in the portion really written by scribe 3, vol. 4, ff. 11–146, *us, uf* predominate, *aus, auf* occurring now and then, but never *ous, ouf*, which are the characteristic forms of scribe 1; Jelinek has recognized these differences, pp. 38–39, but has failed to take them into account here. Furthermore, as regards the last section, vol. 6, ff. 225–231, Jelinek's own testimony is sufficient to show that this belongs to the Bavarian scribe. On f. 225 alone three instances of *subenten*, for *sibenten* 'seventh,' occur, and Jelinek, p. 25, states: "*suben nur bei γ*" (= Bavarian scribe 2). In conclusion I may state that Dr. Göldlin von Tiefenau has compared the above delimitation of the various scribes with the MS, and his comparison sustains my conclusions.

The following list will give a comprehensive view of the extent of the work of the various scribes:

Middle German scribe 1.

| | |
|----------------------------|----------|
| Vols. 1, 2=240+182=422 ff. | |
| vol. 3, ff. 1-6 | = 6 |
| " 8-128 | = 121 |
| " 137-144 | = 8 |
| vol. 4, 148-211 | = 64 |
| vol. 5, 1-186 | = 186 |
| " 193-206 | = 14 |
| vol. 6, 1-123 | = 123 |
| " 131-138 | = 8 |
| " 153-224 | = 72 |
| Total, | 1024 ff. |

Bavarian scribe 2.

| | |
|-----------------|---------|
| Vol. 3, f. 7 | = 1 f. |
| " ff. 129-136 | = 8 ff. |
| vol. 4, 1-10 | = 10 |
| vol. 5, 187-192 | = 6 |
| vol. 6, 124-130 | = 7 |
| " 139-152 | = 14 |
| " 225-231 | = 7 |
| Total, | 53 ff. |

Middle German scribe 3.

| | |
|--------------------|-----------|
| Vol. 4, ff. 11-146 | = 136 ff. |
|--------------------|-----------|

Bavarian scribe 4.

| | |
|----------------|--------|
| Vol. 4, f. 147 | = 1 f. |
|----------------|--------|

As has already been mentioned incidentally, whenever there is a change of scribes, the old scribe ends on the *verso* of a leaf, while the new one invariably commences with a new leaf. Vol. 3, f. 7, not being filled, also vol. 4, ff. 1-10, were most probably inserted later by scribe 2, on discovering the gaps left by 1 and 3. Vol. 4, f. 147, was inserted much later by scribe 4. The rest of the work of scribe 2 must be considered as having been done at the same time as that of 1 and 3. The fact that in all these other cases—vol. 3, 129-136; vol. 5, 187-192; vol. 6, 124-130, 139-152, 225-231—the pages are full at every change of scribes, precludes the possibility of the assumption of Jelinek, pp. 4, 5, that these portions had dropped out of the original MS, and were replaced later by scribe 2. In this case we must assume that the original remained with the present copy, and also that the original had pages of exactly the same size as the present Wb.; otherwise the last page of the inserted parts would not have been full, as is shown by vol. 3, f. 7; vol. 4, f. 10, f. 147. Furthermore, the section vol. 3, 129-136, which contains the new translation, could not have been in the original, as in that case its limits would not have corresponded exactly with the limits of the scribe who wrote it. As the last page of this is full also, we must assume that it was written just after the preceding portion and just before the following.

A causal connection probably exists between the various changes of scribes and the repetitions occurring there, which are to be explained as follows: When scribe 1 stopped at vol. 3, 128, he underscored in the original the last two words that he had copied, as a sign for the following scribe. The latter then started with the underscored words, but thought he would continue with a translation of his own. At the end of his eight leaves he marked the place in the original which he had reached, and the next scribe copied the underscored word again. This process was repeated at each change. F. 152, vol. 6, ends with a book, Jeremiah, and consequently there was no repetition.

In the case of the portions inserted later, the reviser who compared the copy with the original in the same way underscored the last words of the part to be inserted.

The duplicate version of Isaiah and Jeremiah, in vol. 4, is entirely by scribe 3 (except the first ten ff., which were later added by 2), and this is the whole extent of the work of that scribe. It may be that this was intended for another copy, which has not come down to us, and was put into the Wb. by mistake, in place of the books following Ezekiel; or it may be that the scribe mistook a mark in the original and began at the wrong place.

Walther treats this question of the MS and the arrangement of the text, col. 291-294, but his treatment is very inaccurate. He states that there may have been different scribes at work, but where, he does not know—col. 294: "Es mag der mit dem Gebet Manasse beginnende Band auf mehrere Schreiber verteilt worden sein, von denen der zweite mit Judith begann, und der erste, ohne der ihm gesteckten Grenze sich zu erinnern, einfach seine Pergamentbogen vollschrieb, welche etwas mehr Raum boten als man vorher berechnet hatte." He refers then to the duplicate portion of Judith 1. 1-7, but his supposition is entirely erroneous, as the duplicate page is by scribe 4 and was inserted later. Furthermore, the *same* scribe (1) wrote the first part of Judith in vol. 3, and the continuation in vol. 4. There are indeed several scribes in the volume to which Walther refers, but not where he supposes them to be.

Concerning the two versions of Isaiah and Jeremiah he says, col. 292: "Ohne Zweifel aber ist jener erste Teil des 4. Bandes gar nicht ein Bestandteil der eigentlichen Wenzelbibel, sondern dieser nur aus Versehen einverleibt. Denn er ist mit anderer Tinte und von anderer Hand geschrieben als das Vorhergehende

und Nachfolgende; und die Schreibung der Worte ist meistens eine von derjenigen in den übrigen Teilen abweichende, obwohl die Uebersetzung im Grund genau dieselbe ist. So lesen wir in der wirklichen Wenzelbibel: zu, ouf, milch, vliessen, wenne, menige; hier dagegen öfter: czu, uff, milich, vliisen, wann, menke. Auch begegnen wir hier manchen Versehen, welche der 6. Band nicht kennt, und die man für Hörfehler halten möchte. So lautet Is. 1. 3 im 4. Bande: Der auch sy hat erchant die chripp, im 6. Bande aber richtig und in anderem Dialect: Der ochse hat erkannt die crippe." He is here unable to discriminate between two very different dialects in vol. 4, Isaiah, though he quotes from both—first *uff*, *vliisen*, then *erchant*, *chripp*;—he merely assigns the whole to a new scribe, writing in a new dialect.

Next he quotes two other slight inaccuracies in Isaiah, vol. 4, to show the difference between this text and that of vol. 6: *verstumten* in vol. 4 = *vertumten* in vol. 6, and *regel*, vol. 4 = *rogel*, vol. 6. These inaccuracies of vol. 4, all of which have been quoted above, are insignificant scribal errors and do not prove anything. He then shows by a single instance, Is. 60. 5, where vol. 4 has correctly *die menke des meres*, while vol. 6 has only *die menige*, that vol. 4 can not have been copied from vol. 6. Nowhere, however, does he eliminate or even mention the possibility that both texts may have been copied from one and the same MS, unless he takes the above-mentioned differences, which are the only ones that he gives, as sufficient to prove this, which is certainly not the case. He proceeds, nevertheless: "So sind denn die beiden Bücher Isaias und Jeremias im 4. Bande ein Teil einer zweiten Handschrift dieses Kreises und von der Wenzelbibel auszuschliessen. Genau genommen also würden wir sie als eine zwölfte Handschrift zu zählen haben." In this connection Walther also fails to note the fact that the duplicate translation of Jeremiah contains the Lamentations, while the other, in the sixth volume, does not. This fact alone would prove that the version in vol. 4 was not copied from vol. 6. By calling the version in vol. 4 the duplicate, and eliminating it, the MS would have an additional lacuna.

The agreements of the two texts, which Walther does not consider, are much greater than the differences, as may be seen by reference to the following table, which is by no means exhaustive, the instances being taken from extracts which were made for other purposes.

Table showing agreements between the two versions of Isaiah and Jeremiah in the Wenzelbibel.

| | <i>Vulgate.</i> | <i>The two versions in vols. 4 and 6 of the Wenzelbibel agree.</i> | <i>The other related MSS have different readings.</i> |
|--------------|---|--|---|
| Isaiah 2. 3 | et ad domum Dei Jacob | zu dem <i>hauss</i> <i>gotes</i> hern iacobes | zu dem <i>gotz hauss</i> [des] herren yacobs |
| Is. 7. 6 | regem <i>in medio eius</i> filium | Kunig den sun | Kunig <i>in seiner mitte</i> den sun |
| Is. 41. 1 | ad iudicium | <i>zu</i> gerichte | <i>mit</i> gerichte |
| Is. 50. 8 | stemus simul, quis est adversarius noster? accedat | mit einander ste wir, wer ist mein widersache, er trete czu | mit einander ste wir, <i>wer wider-</i> <i>saget mir</i> , wer ist mein widersache, er trete zu |
| Jerem. 8. 14 | silere nos fecit | hat uns <i>sweigende</i> gemacht | hat uns sweigen gemacht |
| Jer. 35. 11 | a facie exercitus <i>Chaldaeorum, et a facie</i> <i>exercitus</i> Syriae | angesicht des heres der siren und sein bliiben | angesicht des heres <i>der Caldeer</i> <i>und von der angesicht des</i> <i>heres</i> der siren |
| Jer. 51. 11 | acuite sagittas | scherffet die <i>geschos</i> | scherpfet dye pfeyll |

These instances in which the two texts of the Wenzelbibel agree, as against variant readings of the other MSS, are much more important than the differences quoted by Walther. Especially noteworthy are the omissions Is. 7. 6, *in seiner mitte*, and Jer. 35. 11, *der Caldeer und von der angesicht des heres*. The insertion, in all the other MSS, of the clause *wer widersaget mir*, is also significant, while the two texts of the Wb. follow the Vulgate. The change of *pfeyll* to *geschos*, Jer. 51. 11, and the order *hause gotes* as against *gotz hauss* also show the close relationship of the two texts under discussion. There is consequently no valid objection to the supposition that both were copied from one and the same MS.

The translation itself is doubtless of Middle German origin: Jelinek places it in Bohemia, in the vicinity of Prague, but he does not take into account the other MSS. The present MS is probably the oldest of the group, with the possible exception of the fragment cgm. 341. The earliest dated MS is Maihingen III D. 1, fol. 1 (1437). This also has strongly marked Middle German characteristics, as also the Weimar MS fol. 3-8, dated 1458, and the Nürnberg MS cent III, N 41-43, dated 1437-43. The MS at Nikolsburg I was unable to examine, as the official in charge was absent at the time of my visit.

The MSS of Walther's second subdivision, which have partly this text, partly a different one, are all late, and the Middle German characteristics have been obliterated, as they were written by Bavarian scribes: Cgm. 219-221, written 1463, by *Oswald Nott*, at *Tegernsee*; cgm. 502-503, written 1463, by *Georg Rörer*, at *Regensburg*; Maihingen 1, 3, D., fol. III, IV, written 1468, by *Georg Rörer*. Gotha MS 10 is closely related, but date and scribe are unknown. The Middle German origin of the translation is therefore established beyond peradventure.